

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-36 and 38-45 are currently pending, Claims 17-24 and 32 having been amended. The changes and additions to the claims do not add new matter and are supported by the originally filed specification, for example, on page 6, lines 2-14, page 6, line 22 to page 7, line 9, and Figure 1.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 22 and 23 were objected to for informalities; Claims 17-19, 25, 31, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borthwick (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0236836) in view of Ellson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,805,783, hereinafter “Ellson”); Claims 20-24, 26-28, 32-36, and 42-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borthwick in view of Ellson and Abdel-Aziz et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0064511, hereinafter “Abdel-Aziz”); and Claims 29-30 and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borthwick in view of Ellson, Abdel-Aziz, and Khare (“Bitstream portable font resources for Web pages,” 20 February 1997, retrieved from <http://www.xent.com/FoRK-archive/winter96/0524.html> on May 1, 2009) (hereinafter, “Khare”).

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Isom and his supervisor for the courtesy of an interview with Applicants’ representatives, Mr. Tyson Crane and Mr. Sameer Gokhale, on August 11, 2010. During the interview, Applicants’ representatives explained the claimed features of the present invention and discussed the differences between the claims and the applied reference. Proposed clarifying amendments to the claims were further discussed. The examiner indicated how he may interpret the applied art to disclose the features in the proposed amendments. In the current response the claims include amendments that are not the same as those discussed during the interview.

Applicants note that the status indicator of Claim 23 of the amendment filed on February 16, 2010, should have stated “Currently Amended.” However, Applicants believe that the previous amendment to Claim 23 has been entered, and thus, the present amendment incorporates those changes.

With respect to the objection to Claim 22, Claim 22 has been amended to recite reproducing “the” 3D character mail and to delete the “thereby” clause. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the present amendment overcomes these grounds of objection.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to Claim 17 overcomes this ground of rejection.

Amended Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*,

said server to store the 3D font, to generate control information independent of the 3D font and about the 3D font for expressing the text message on the basis of the received instruction information, and to store the received text message and the generated control information as 3D message information independent from the 3D font, said control information including parameters for animating and creating a display appearance of the 3D font.

Turning to the primary reference, Borthwick describes a system for the design and sharing of rich media productions.¹ Borthwick explains that a creator uses author computer 110 to create the rich media production with files from locations, such as web sites.² In Borthwick the created rich media production is stored in an associated text record on a host computer 120, and thereafter, a recipient computer 140 may use the text record to recreate and access the rich media production.³

In addition, Borthwick explains that the author computer 110, includes a writer template which provides the core functionality for the creation of the rich media production

¹ Borthwick, Title.

² *Id.* at [0025].

³ *Id.*

and provides a vehicle for author computer 110 to communicate with host server 120.⁴

Borthwick further explains that after the rich media production is created, a message with the URL that is associated with the production, may be sent to recipients.⁵ When the email is sent in Borthwick, a unique text data string, representing all the features of the entire rich media production, is stored on the host computer 120.⁶ Furthermore, Borthwick describes an animation menu that may be imported into the writer template and used to affect the appearance and behavior of the selected text box.⁷

The Office Action asserts, at page 5, line 2, that the unique text data string in Borthwick corresponds to the control information of Claim 17.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Borthwick fails to disclose or suggest at least a server to store the 3D font, *to generate control information independent of the 3D font* and about the 3D font for expressing the text message on the basis of the received instruction information, and to store the received text message and the generated control information as 3D message information *independent from the 3D font, said control information including parameters for animating and creating a display appearance of the 3D font*. By contrast, Borthwick merely describes a unique text data string that is stored in a server that represents all the features of the entire rich media production. Thus, even if we were to assume that the unique text data string of Borthwick corresponds to control information, the unique text data string is not *generated independent of the 3D font* and *stored independently* from any type of font. Thus, the unique text data string in Borthwick does not correspond to the control information recited in amended Claim 17.

⁴ *Id.* at [0026].

⁵ *Id.* at [0056].

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Id.* at [0049].

Furthermore, even if we were to alternatively assume that the animation variables of Borthwick correspond to control information, the animation variables are not ***generated independent of the 3D font and stored independently*** from any type of font.

Borthwick describes an animation menu that is used in the writer template to set variables describing animation actions or affect the appearance of a selected text box which produces embedded font.⁸ As discussed above, the writer template in Borthwick provides the functionality for the creation of the rich media production, which is ultimately written and stored on a server as the text data string.⁹ In other words, any animation variables that may be set are ultimately stored in a single text data string, which includes all properties of all images in the production. Thus, even we were to alternatively assume that the animation variables of Borthwick corresponds to control information, the animation variables of Borthwick are not ***generated independent of the 3D font and stored independently*** from any type of font.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Borthwick fails to disclose or suggest a ***server to generate control information***, where the ***control information includes parameters for animating and creating a display appearance of the 3D font***. By contrast, Borthwick merely describes assigning a fixed property in expressing each character. In Borthwick the middleware software 128 receives a session file and variables file and assigns each variable in the variable data file to its corresponding variable category in a unique text data string.¹⁰ Thus, even if we were to assume that the text data string of Borthwick corresponds to the control information, Borthwick still fails to disclose or suggest ***generating control information*** where the ***control information includes parameters for animating and creating a display appearance of the 3D font***.

⁸ *Id.* at [0030], [0047], [0049]-[0052].

⁹ *Id.* at [0026], [0056].

¹⁰ *Id.* at [0056].

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 17 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Borthwick.

Ellson, Abdel-Aziz, and Khare, have been considered but fail to remedy the deficiencies of Borthwick with regard to amended Claim 17. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 17 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Borthwick, Ellson, Abdel-Aziz, and Khare, either alone or in proper combination.

Amended independent Claims 19, 20, 21, and 23 recite features similar to those of amended Claim 17 discussed above. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 19, 20, 21, and 23 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguish over Borthwick, Ellson, Abdel-Aziz, and Khare, either alone or in proper combination.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 23, Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection in part. Amended Claim 23 recites, *inter alia*,

a first terminal to create 3D character mail by generating control information independent of a 3D font about the 3D font for expressing an input text message, and to transmit the text message and the generated control information directly to a second terminal, said control information including parameters for animating and creating a display appearance of the 3D font; and

said second terminal to store the 3D font and to reproduce the 3D character mail only on the basis of the text message and the control information received directly from said first terminal and the 3D font stored in said second terminal.

The Office Action asserts that the animation menu of Borthwick corresponds to the control information of Claim 23 and that the text data string of Borthwick corresponds to the 3D font stored in the second terminal of Claim 23.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Borthwick fails to disclose or suggest a first terminal to create 3D character mail by generating ***control information independent of a 3D font*** and a second terminal to store the 3D font. By contrast, Borthwick merely describes a text data string including data representing the animation menu. Thus, even if we

were to assume that the animation menu of Borthwick corresponds to the control information of Claim 23, Borthwick fails to disclose or suggest *a said second terminal to store the 3D font*.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 23 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Borthwick.

Ellson, Abdel-Aziz, and Khare, have been considered but fail to remedy the deficiencies of Borthwick with regard to amended Claim 23. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 23 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over Borthwick, Ellson, Abdel-Aziz, and Khare, either alone or in proper combination.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references fail to disclose or suggest the features of Claim 45. Claim 45 recites that the control information includes at least a parameter for 3D font motion and a parameter for 3D font morphing. By contrast, Borthwick merely describes animation variables for movement, resize, and transparency.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Sameer Gokhale
Registration No. 62,618